

## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge		James E	3. Moran	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge						
CASE NUMBER		04 C	4838	DATE	12/1/	2004				
CASE TITLE		GREGORY L. ASHFORD, et al vs. UNNAMED COOK COUNTY CORR OFFICERS								
[In the following box (a) indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, defendant, 3rd of the motion being presented.]						ndant, 3rd party plaintiff, and	(b) state briefly the nature			
MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER										
DOCKET ENTRY:										
(1)	F	Filed motion of [ use listing in "Motion" box above.]								
(2)	□ в	Brief in support of motion due								
(3)	□ A	Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due								
(4)	□ R	Ruling/Hearing on set for at								
(5)	□ St	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(6)	□ Pi	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(7)	<b>(1)</b>	Trial[set for/re-set for] on at								
(8)	<b>I</b> ] $\square$	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at								
(9)		This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to]  □ FRCP4(m) □ Local Rule 41.1 □ FRCP41(a)(1) □ FRCP41(a)(2).								
(10)	(10) [Other docket entry] Enter Memorandum Opinion And Order. Defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiff's complaint is denied.									
	- ·		-							
$\cdot$ .										
(11)	(11) For further detail see order attached to the original minute order.]									
(11)	<del>-</del>		dvised in open court.	attached to the origin	mir minute order.j		* Document			
	No notices requi	No notices required.				number of notices	Number			
	Notices mailed by judge's staff.				, 1	EC 0 2 2004				
Notified counsel by tele			_		<b>1</b> 4	date docketed				
<b>✓</b>	Docketing to mail notices.  Mail AO 450 form.					07	$  \mathcal{Q}  $			
	Copy to judge/magistrate judge.			I <i>R</i> 390	าวเลาระ อเรากา	docketing deputy nitials				
re		courtroom deputy's	09:5	M9 1-0304005	date mailed notice					
		initials	Date/time	received in a limit						

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

GREGORY L. ASHFORD, NIKITUS ) CROSS, DANIEL JIMERSON, and ) RUFUS WILLIAMS,		
Plaintiffs, )		
vs.	No. 04 C 4838	
UNNAMED COOK COUNTY  CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS, COOK  COUNTY SHERIFF, and COUNTY OF  COOK		
COOK, ) Defendants. )		DEC 0 2 2004
MEMORANDUM :	OPINION AND ORDER	7EL 0 2 2004

Plaintiffs sue for alleged injuries suffered as a result of various civil rights violations.

Cook County moves to dismiss, contending that it is not liable for the actions of persons employed by the Sheriff of Cook County and, besides, plaintiffs have not alleged that they

complied with the exhaustion requirement of the Prison Litigation Reform Act.

The County is not itself liable for the conduct of the Sheriff's employees, but it is an indispensable party because it must pay any settlement or judgment. Carver v. Sheriff of LaSalle County, 324 F.3d 947 (7th Cir. 2003). It is a defendant only for Carver purposes. Failure to exhaust is an affirmative defense (and here more properly raised by the Sheriff since the County is merely a stakeholder). It probably is better practice for plaintiffs to allege compliance, but here they have made it clear that they believe they have complied. If they are wrong, we expect some defendant will be so alleging. The motion to dismiss is denied.

JAMES B. MORAN
Senior Judge, U. S. District Court

<u>Dec. /</u>, 2004